

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-62 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-9, 12, 17, 18, 20-22, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon U.S. patent 2,271,508 (hereinafter "Gordon"). Claims 10, 11, 13-16, 23-39 and 32-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Mindes U.S. patent 5,573,244 (hereinafter "Mindes").

II. Summary of Applicant's Reply to Office Action

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that this application is allowable over the references of record.

III. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

III.1 Claim 1

Applicants' independent claim 1 is directed towards a method for providing the projected effects of wagering on parimutuel pools to a user in an interactive wagering system. A user input proposing a wager that is associated with at least one parimutuel pool is received. Information that affects the user's potential winnings based on the user input is obtained.

The projected effect that the user's proposed wager would have on the parimutuel pool is provided to the user.

The Examiner contends that Gordon shows a method for providing the projected effects of wagering on parimutuel pools to the user (see Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree. As will be described below, applicants respectfully submit that Gordon simply discloses providing current parimutuel pool odds based on wagers that have been placed, rather than the Examiner's contention that Gordon shows the projected effect a player's proposed wager will have on a parimutuel pool.

More specifically, in one exemplary embodiment Gordon shows a calculating device that calculates the total amount bet on each horse in a two-horse race, the total amount bet on all the horses in the race and the odds for each horse in the race (see Gordon, column 1, lines 18-24 and column 3, lines 55-58). FIG. 1 of Gordon shows bridge A and bridge B which are Wheatstone bridges that provide the resistances that store the total amounts bet on horse 1 and horse 2, respectively. Bridge C is a Wheatstone bridge that provides the resistances that store the total amount bet on all the horses in the race. Since in this case there are only two horses, the total amount bet would be the sum of the values of bridge A and bridge B.

Bridge D and bridge E are Wheatstone bridges that provide the resistances that store the odds for horse 1 and horse 2, respectively.

When a bet is placed on a horse, the amount of the bet is inputted at booth 10 or booth 11 (see Gordon, column 3, lines 56-59 and FIG. 1). Each booth contains a betting device, such as that shown in FIGS. 2-4, to allow for user input. An input is effected by pressing key 75 of the betting device. Each depression of key 75 represents a certain dollar amount bet on the chosen horse. Depressing key 75 actuates discs 84 and discs 85 to rotate counterclockwise. The discs are arranged in such a way that the counterclockwise rotation of the discs increases the resistance of the circuit associated with the chosen horse located at the booth.

For example, in FIG. 1, circuit 12 in booth 10 is associated with horse 1. Thus, inputs made by depressing key 75 of the betting device in booth 10 to bet on horse 1 will increase the resistance of circuit 12. The increased resistance of circuit 12 creates an imbalance in its associated bridge, bridge A, based on the fundamentals of the Wheatstone Bridge. The circuitry of FIG. 1 is rebalanced by increasing the resistances in bridge A. Once bridge A is rebalanced, the resistances of bridge A represent the new total amount bet on

horse 1, which is the old total amount bet on horse 1 plus the new bet placed. This input also propagates imbalances to bridges C, D and E which may be rebalanced based on the fundamentals of the Wheatstone Bridge. Thus, the resistance of bridge C will adjust to store the new total amount bet on the race. If the new bet placed changes the odds for the horses, then the resistances of bridge D and bridge E may be adjusted to store the new odds for horse 1 and horse 2, respectively.

The Examiner contends that the input into the betting device of FIGS. 2-4 represents a proposed bet (see Office Action, page 2). Applicants submit that, as described above, there is no aspect of the bet described in Gordon that may be considered "proposed." A proposed bet is a bet that has not been placed. As described in applicants' specification, a user may either finalize a proposed wager (i.e., place the proposed wager) or not finalize a proposed wager (i.e., not place the proposed wager). See, e.g., step 1732 of FIG. 17B.

In Gordon, however, when key 75 is pressed, the amount inputted represents values in dollars of the amount actually bet on a horse, not a proposed bet (see Gordon, column 6, line 30 to column 7, line 37). This inputted bet cannot be removed from the parimutuel pool. As described above, the inputted bet changes the state of the entire calculating device. Pressing

key 75 causes discs 84 and 85 to rotate counterclockwise increasing the resistances in the circuit for the horse bet on in the booth (e.g., circuit 12 for horse 1). This propagates changes to the resistances in the other Wheatstone bridges (e.g., the values stored in bridge A, representing the amount bet on horse 1, will increase). The betting device of FIGS. 2-4 is constructed such that depressing key 75 can only cause discs 84 and 85 to be rotated counterclockwise and cannot rotate clockwise. In fact, a mechanism (spring fingers 97) is placed in the betting device to prevent clockwise rotation (see Gordon, column 7, lines 46-49). Therefore, a depression of key 75 can only cause an increase of the resistances, and thus only add bets to the calculating device. Any clockwise rotation, which might conceivably decrease the resistances, is prevented by spring fingers 97.

Additionally, cam element 96 is provided that allows discs 84 and 85 to be reset to the zero resistance, or starting, position (see Gordon, column 7, lines 38-44). Resetting discs 84 and 85 to the starting position has the effect of resetting the total amount bet on a horse using the betting device to zero. This fails, however, to affect a particular bet inputted by pressing key 75 and thus Gordon only shows the ability to reset all bets placed at the betting device.

Therefore, Gordon only shows providing the current parimutuel pool odds rather than the projected effect on the parimutuel pool of a proposed wager.

Accordingly, Gordon fails to show or suggest applicant's invention as specified by claim 1. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

III.2

Claim 17

Applicants' independent claim 17 is directed towards a method for providing the projected effects of wagering on odds associated with a proposed wager in an interactive wagering system. A user input to create the proposed wager that is associated with at least one parimutuel pool is received. Parimutuel pool information and current odds for the proposed wager are obtained. The effect that the proposed wager would have on the current odds is determined and projected odds are provided to the user.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 17 for the same reason as independent claim 1 (see Office Action, page 2). As demonstrated above, Gordon merely shows a device that calculates the total amount bet on each horse in a race, the total amount bet on all the horses in the race and the odds on each horse in the race.

Accordingly, Gordon fails to show or suggest determining the effect that the user's proposed wager would have on the current odds as specified by claim 17. In addition, Gordon fails to show or suggest providing projected odds to the user as specified by claim 17. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

IV. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103
 Of Claims 32 and 48

Applicants' independent claim 32 is directed towards an interactive wagering system for providing the projected effects of wagering on parimutuel pools to a user. A user input device receives user input to propose a wager that is associated with at least one parimutuel pool. Circuitry is configured to obtain information for the proposed wager that affect user's potential winnings based on the user input and display what projected effects the user's proposed wager would have on the parimutuel pool to the user.

Applicants' independent claim 48 is directed towards an interactive wagering system for providing what effect wagering would have on current odds associated with a proposed wager. A user input device receives user input to create the proposed wager that is associated with at least one parimutuel

pool. Circuitry is configured to obtain parimutuel pool information and current odds for the proposed wager, to determine what projected effects the wager can have on the current odds and to display projected odds to the user.

The Examiner admitted that "Gordon does not teach use of a digital computer" and attempts to modify Gordon with Mindes to show applicants' approaches (Office Action, page 5). As demonstrated above, Gordon fails to show or suggest all of applicants' claimed features because it does not show or suggest providing what the projected effect the user's proposed wager would have on the parimutuel pool and it does not show or suggest determining the effect the proposed wager would have on the current odds and providing projected odds to the user.

Therefore, even if Gordon were modified with Mindes, the combination would fail to show or suggest all of the features of claims 32 and 48. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 32 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. Dependent Claims 2-16, 18-31, 33-47 and 49-62

Claims 2-16 are dependent from claim 1 and are allowable at least because claim 1 is allowable. Claims 18-31 are dependent from claim 17 and are allowable at least because claim 17 is allowable. Claims 33-47 are dependent from claim 32

and are allowable at least because claim 32 is allowable.
Claims 49-62 are dependent from claim 48 and are allowable at
least because claim 48 is allowable.

VI. Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-62 are
patentable. This application is therefore in condition for
allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly
respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Leiz
Registration No. 46,109
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax : (212) 596-9090